



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Inns and Innkeepers—Liability of Restaurant Proprietor for Loss of Overcoat.—In *Apfel v. Whyte*, 180 N. Y. S. 712, the Supreme Court of New York held that the proprietor of a restaurant was not liable for the loss of a guest's overcoat, which he handed to a waiter, who hung it on a nearby hook, and the guest could have taken it at any time without leave.

The court said in part: "We are dealing with a subject that is a matter of every-day experience with most of us, a commonplace of life in a large city, and we know that restaurant managers do not, and in the nature of things can not, station employees to stand guard over coats and hats, unchecked, and hung on hooks about the room. Even if there were such watchers, they would not know which coat belonged to a given guest. Nor can the waiter be expected to care for the coats and hats of the guests he is serving, for a large part of the time he is necessarily going to, coming from, and in the kitchen.

"Checking stands or racks, with boys in charge, are provided in most restaurants of any size, except those that cater exclusively to persons seeking inexpensive meals, for the very purpose of relieving guests of the burden and worry of exercising care in respect of their coats, hats, umbrellas, sticks, handbags, and other things commonly carried into restaurants. Is it not a natural and instinctive thing for one whose coat has been hung up on a hook near his seat occasionally to look in that direction to see that it is still there? I do not believe it enters into the head of such a guest to assume that he has thrown off all responsibility for the safety of his property; indeed, it seems to me that, on the contrary, he feels himself under a decided compulsion to guard it. A guest may, of course, enter into a special arrangement with a restaurant proprietor by which the guest's property shall become the subject of special care; but there is no pretense of any such express bailment here."

Inns and Innkeepers—Right of Guest to Leave Where Dining Room Infested with Flies.—In *Williams v. Sweet*, 110 Atl. 316, the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine held that in view of the well-known disease-carrying characteristic of the common house fly, a hotel guest is warranted in leaving regardless of contract for longer stay, where the dining room is infested with a large number of flies.

In referring to the dangerous nature of flies, the court said in part: "It is a matter of common knowledge that the common house fly has come to be regarded by the enlightened understanding, not only as one of the most annoying and repulsive of insects, but one of the most dangerous in its capacity to gather, carry, and disseminate the germs of disease. He is the meanest of all scavengers. He delights in reveling in all kinds of filth; the greater the putres-